Lean Six Sigma Project Briefing

Title 40/CCA Certification and Confirmation Process

Presented to:
Mr. Dave Wennergren (NII/DoD CIO)
Dr. Nancy Spruill (OUSD/AT&L)
December 22, 2008

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER
Creating an Information Advantage

Title 40/CCA Certification & Confirmation Process – Define Problem (Briefed Previously)

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
Richard Sylvester & Ed Wingfield	**Process Owners**	**ARA/DCIO ITI &CP**	**Driver**
Tomatra Minor	**Master Black Belt**	**NII/CIO**	**Driver**
Mr. David Wennergren & Dr. Nancy Spruill	**Sponsors**	**NII/CIO, AT&L**	**Approver**

CCA improves the design, development, use, and performance of IT investments

Charter

Problem Statement:	The Title 40/CCA process is perceived as non-value added, with redundant inputs, documentation and oversight. Roles, responsibilities, and metrics are unclear, and the process is not consistently executed or linked to the organizational mission and goals.
Business Case:	Reasons we are working this project: ▪ To improve the effectiveness of certification and confirmation process ▪ To decrease certification and confirmation processing time
Customer Specifications:	Streamlined, user-friendly CCA process that is more effective, efficient, and timelier than today's process.
Start:	Pre-MS A
Stop:	Full-Rate Production Decision Review (FRPDR)
Scope:	Title 40/CCA certification & confirmation process (Pre MSA -FRPDR) for all DoD Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS) and Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAP).

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define Problem	**16 Sep 08**	**07 Oct 08**	●
Collect VoC	**28 Oct 08**	**18 Nov 08**	●
Select Projects	**6 Nov 08**	**18 Nov 08**	●
Recommend Projects	**6 Nov 08**	**19 Nov 08**	●
Launch Projects	**Dec 08**	**TBD**	○

Title 40/CCA Certification and Confirmation: Project Problem Statements

1. **Improving the Quality of Outcome Measures:**

   A three year sampling of data of Initial Capabilities Documents (ICDs) reveals that X% (X out of Y) failed to articulate outcome measures (formerly measures of effectiveness (MOEs)) thereby increasing requirement changes that contribute to cost and schedule overruns. (Black Belt project)

2. **Improving Post Implementation Reviews (PIRs):**

   Post Implementation Reviews (PIR) are not being conducted by all MAIS and MDAP solutions for capability gaps, thereby hampering the DoD's ability to identify and report on capability portfolio development trends and best practices. (Green Belt project)

3. **Optimizing CCA and Defense Acquisition Processes:**

   7 of 11 key Title 40/CCA compliance requirements duplicate the Defense Acquisition System (DAS) (i.e., DoDI 5000.02) regulatory requirements for MAIS and MDAP acquisitions. (Green Belt project)

4. **Applying BPR at Time of Gap Identification:**

   BPR knowledge/training/expertise is not presently being applied at the time of identification of a business capability gap/need (prior to a materiel solution) based upon Oct/Nov 2008 BPR survey. (Black Belt project)

1. Improving the Quality of Outcome Measures

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
Ron Richardson	**Black Belt (C)***	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Sponsor**	**Joint Staff (?)**	**Approver**
LoraLee Kodozo	**MBB**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Process Owner**	**Joint Staff (?)**	**Approver**

Having outcome measures in place reduces investment costs & schedule overruns

LSS Charter

Problem Statement:	A three year sampling of data of Initial Capabilities Documents (ICDs) reveals that X% (X out of Y) failed to articulate outcome measures (formerly measures of effectiveness (MOEs)) thereby increasing requirement changes that contribute to cost and schedule overruns.
Business Case:	▪Ability to assess mission area capability ▪Reduce costs associated with requirement changes due to lack of outcome measures.
Unit:	Initial Capabilities Document
Defect:	ICDs without capability outcome measures
Customer Specifications:	ICDs are required to have outcome measures of the desired effect needed to fill a capability gap.
Start:	Submission of an ICD into the JROC Knowledge Management/Decision Support (KMDS) system
Stop:	Approved ICD
Scope:	New IT/NSS investments under the purview of the Logistics (L), Command & Control (C2) and Net-Centric (NC) functional capability boards (FCB).

*** (C) = Candidate in Training; Not certified**

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	**Dec 08**	**dd mm yy**	
Measure	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Analyze	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Improve	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Control	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	

2. Improving Post Implementation Reviews (PIRS)

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
Len Sadauskas	**Green Belt**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Sponsor**	**PSA/CPM (?)**	**Approver**
Tomatra Minor	**MBB**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Process Owner**	**PSA/CPM (?)**	**Approver**

PIR data enables capability portfolio development trend analysis and identification of best practices

LSS Charter

Problem Statement:	PIRs are not being conducted by all MAIS and MDAP solutions for capability gaps, thereby hampering the DoD's ability to identify and report on capability portfolio development trends and best practices.
Business Case:	▪Ensure that PIRs are conducted ▪Implement standardized reporting ▪Enable analysis of trends and identify potential capability development best practices
Unit:	PIR Report
Defect:	PIR not conducted, inability to conduct trend analysis and to identify best practices
Customer Specifications:	Ability to develop PIR Report trend analysis and best practice identification
Start:	Receipt of PIR Plan
Stop:	PIR Report issued, recipients complete analysis of trends, and best practices documented
Scope:	All MDAP and MAIS under DoDI 5000.02 Table 2-1

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	**Dec 08**	**dd mm yy**	
Measure	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Analyze	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Improve	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Control	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	

3. Optimizing CCA and Defense Acquisition Processes

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
Mr. Wennergren	**Green Belt**	**DoD IMI &NT**	**Driver**
Tomatra Minor	**MBB**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Sponsor**	**DoD CIO / AT&L**	**Approver**
Ed Wingfield	**Process Owner**	**DoD CIO**	**Contributor**

Eliminating duplicate compliance & documentation requirements allowing PMs to focus on program execution

LSS Charter

Problem Statement:	7 of 11 key Title 40/CCA compliance requirements duplicate the Defense Acquisition System (DAS) (i.e., DoDI 5000.02) regulatory requirements for MAIS and MDAP acquisitions.
Business Case:	▪Optimize DAS processes to meet Title 40/CCA requirements ▪Eliminate duplicate compliance & documentation requirements ▪Permit PM to focus on program execution not documentation
Unit:	Title 40/CCA Compliance documentation
Defect:	Duplicate compliance and documentation requirements for the 7 Title 40/CCA elements addressed in the DAS.
Customer Specifications:	No duplication of compliance & documentation requirements (for PMs)
Start:	Milestone A.
Stop:	Full-Rate Production Decision Review (FRPDR)
Scope:	Title 40/CCA compliance process for all DoD Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS) and Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAP) (i.e., all ACAT I programs at all milestones).

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	**Dec 08**	**dd mm yy**	
Measure	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Analyze	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Improve	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Control	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	

4. Applying BPR at Time of Gap

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
TBD	**Sponsor**	**DoN-FM or P&R - IM(?)**	**Approver**
Dr. Robert Pratt	**Black Belt**	**DAU**	**Driver**
TBD	**MBB**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Process Owner**	**DoN-FM or P&R - IM(?)**	**Approver**

Applying knowledgeable trained BPR resources at point of need/gap establishment will improve the likelihood of process optimization

CPI Charter

Hypothesis:	BPR knowledge/training/expertise is not presently being applied at the time of identification of a business capability gap/need (prior to a materiel solution) based upon the October/November 2008 BPR survey.
Business Case:	•BPR, applied in the time space following establishment of a need/gap and prior to the decision to fund a materiel solution, facilitates process optimization and streamlining. •An effective intervention (even short-term in the initial discussion of how the a capability gap gets framed and solved) can help to assure that both non-materiel and materiel solutions receive consideration. •BPR intervention enhances the probability that clear and measurable desired outcomes will be established.
Unit:	The unit is an individual business capability gap, at the time of initially chartering a team to investigate the gap.
Defect:	Intervention results in: 1) potential for streamlining processes and 2) clear and measurable desired outcomes.
Customer Specifications:	BPR considerations are effectively communicated and made part of the initial analysis of a business capability gap.
Start:	The intervention starts at the time a team is chartered to find a path to filling an identified gap in business capabilities.
Stop:	The intervention stops when the chartered team has documented 1) potential for streamlining processes and 2) clear and measurable desired outcomes.
Scope:	Only business capability gaps that may potentially result in MAIS investments are in scope.

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	**Dec 08**	**dd mm yy**	
Measure	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Analyze	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Improve	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Control	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	

Current Project Team Members

Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Team 4
1. Ron Richardson (DCIO)	1. Len Sadauskas (DCIO)	1. Dave Wennergren (DCIO)	1. Tom Hickok (DCIO)
2. LTC Rose Card (Army G6/CIO)	2. Amelia Grazioso (DCIO)	2. Ed Wingfield (DCIO)	2. Leslie Margolis (BTA)
3. Jack Zavin (NII/DoD-CIO)	3. Rick Perron (DCIO)	3. Bob Leach (AT&L)	3. Roy Mabry (DCIO)
4. Neal Zank (AF CIO)	4. CDR Ben Torreon (J6)	4. Amelia Grazioso (DCIO)	
5. Bill Cooper (J8)	5. Stuart Booth (OUSD, AT-SSE)	5. Bill May (NII/Acq)	
		6. John Burson (DoN CIO)	
		7. Gabe Leyva (NII/Acq)	
		8. MaryAnn Engelbert (Navy RDA)	

CCA Advisory Committee Governance Rules

- **Development:**
  - **Working Group members given the opportunity to recommit to the function**
  - **Working Group evolves into a Advisory Committee (AC)**
    - A governance body that provides insight and guidance (not a "Go /No-Go" authority)
    - A forum for BBs and GBs to provide project status and metrics updates on all CCA CPI initiatives
    - The Advisory Committee becomes the knowledge source of all CCA CPI/LSS initiatives in OSD
- **Roles:**
  - **Advisory Committee members are CCA/LSS liaisons to their respective entity/organization**
    - Responsible for bringing CCA/LSS organizational issues to the attention of the AC
    - Responsible for taking CCA/LSS knowledge/learnings/best practices back to their respective organizations
    - Responsible for identifying SMEs/team members in their organizations for participation in future CCA CPI/LSS projects as they are identified
- **Meeting Schedule:**
  - **Monthly meetings (frequency may be adjusted as necessary)**
  - **1st Meeting: Wednesday, January 14, 2009**
  - **Agenda:**
    - Ground Rules
    - Instruction: How to conduct a project review
    - Review CCA LSS Projects Underway

Next Steps

- Present LSS Project Charters to Co-Sponsors (22 Dec 08)
- Launch approved DMAIC projects (Dec ’08 / Jan ‘09)
- Report Project Status (via “Tollgates”)
  - CCA Advisory Committee
  - Co-Sponsor Updates

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER
Creating an Information Advantage

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Backup

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#1: Policies surrounding Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) (i.e., outcome-based performance measures) and Post Implementation Review (PIR) are disjointed in the JCIDS, PPBE, and DAS.	Poorly defined policies surrounding outcome measures (formerly measures of effectiveness MOEs) have led to inconsistent guidance from the JCIDS, PPBE, and DAS, negatively affecting the adoption of interoperable requirements and complicating the oversight process.	**Project: Improving the Quality of Outcome Measures** -- A three year sampling of data of Initial Capabilities Documents (ICDs) reveals that X% (X out of Y) failed to articulate outcome measures (formerly measures of effectiveness (MOEs)) thereby increasing requirement changes that contribute to cost and schedule overruns.	▪Ability to assess mission area capability ▪Reduce costs associated with requirement changes due to lack of outcome measures.	Ron Richardson (Black Belt)

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#1: Policies surrounding Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) (i.e., outcome-based performance measures) and Post Implementation Review (PIR) are disjointed in the JCIDS, PPBE, and DAS.	Poorly defined policies surrounding outcome measures (formerly measures of effectiveness MOEs) have led to inconsistent guidance from the JCIDS, PPBE, and DAS, negatively affecting the adoption of interoperable requirements and complicating the oversight process.	**Project: Address CCA Elements …** -- Over the last x years, X% of Initial Capability Documents (ICDs) have not been CCA compliant in that they do not adequately address: 1) Determining whether the acquisition supports DoD core functions, 2) Outcome-based performance measures, 3) Benchmarking when applicable, and 4) Business Process Re-engineering.	▪Title 40/CCA compliance process is fully integrated into the JCIDS process.	??? (Green Belt)

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#2: The business rules (processes and procedures) for planning and executing a PIR are insufficient.	Post Implementation Reviews (PIR) are not being conducted by all MAIS and MDAP solutions for capability gaps, thereby hampering the DoD's ability to identify and report on capability portfolio development trends and best practices.	**Project: Improving Post implementation reviews (PIRs)** -- PIRs are not being conducted by all MAIS and MDAP solutions for capability gaps, thereby hampering the DoD's ability to identify and report on capability portfolio development trends and best practices.	▪Ensure that PIRs are conducted ▪Implement standardized reporting ▪Enable analysis of trends and identify potential capability development best practices	Len Sadauskas (Green Belt)

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#3: The level of review/oversight associated with the CCA Compliance Table elements is perceived as non-value added.	The streamlining and alignment of the CCA certification process in conjunction with the Acquisition Life Cycle is essential to reducing duplicative efforts and optimizing the Acquisition Life Cycle to satisfy CCA requirements with undue burden to customers.	**Project: Optimizing the CCA/DAS Link** -- Post 7 of 11 key Title 40/CCA compliance requirements duplicate the Defense Acquisition System (DAS) (i.e., DoDI 5000.02) regulatory requirements for MAIS and MDAP acquisitions.	▪Optimize DAS processes to meet Title 40/CCA requirements ▪Eliminate duplicate compliance & documentation* requirements ▪Permit PM to focus on program execution not documentation	Mr. Wennergren (Green Belt)

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#4: For Business Process Re-engineering, there is a documented lack of knowledge-able resources and experienced/trained personnel.	**Project: Defining BPR & Clarifying BPR Responsibilities**-- The lack of knowledgeable BPR resources and experienced/trained personnel negatively impacts the adoption/implementation of BPR.	A substantial majority, x % (y out of 37) of the sampled MAIS stakeholders interviewed see BPR as potentially value-added, but add that CCA oversight of BPR amounts to just a "check in the box". Thus BPR is neither consistently understood nor implemented/ applied thereby failing to meet Title 40/CCA compliance requirements.	In order for BPR to be done effectively, MAIS Functional Proponents must understand: What is BPR? Who is responsible for completing BPR? When should BPR be conducted?	Roy Mabry (Green Belt Candidate)

Alignment of the LSS Projects to Recommendations

Recommended Project (DW & NS)	Revised Project	Project Problem Statement	Business Case	Belt Candidate
#4: For Business Process Re-engineering, there is a documented lack of knowledge-able resources and experienced/trained personnel.	**Project: Applying BPR at Time of Gap Identification** -- The lack of knowledgeable BPR resources and experienced/trained personnel negatively impacts the adoption / implementation of BPR.	BPR knowledge/training/expertise is not presently being applied at the time of identification of a business capability gap/need (prior to a materiel solution) according to October/November 2008 BPR study data and follow-up interviews	▪An effective intervention (even short-term in the initial discussion of how the capability gap gets framed & solved) can positively alter the DoD culture.* ▪Early intervention will assure that clear and measurable desired outcomes are established * Note – while there are instances where a materiel solution is appropriate, it is important to address processes first, then technology.	??? (Black Belt?)

Address CCA Elements in ICDs

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
TBD	Green Belt	TBD	Driver
TBD	Master Black Belt	TBD	Driver
TBD	Sponsor	TBD	Approver
TBD	Process Owner	TBD	Contributor

LSS Charter

Problem Statement:	Over the last x years, X% of Initial Capability Documents (ICDs) have not been CCA compliant in that they do not adequately address: 1) Determining whether the acquisition supports DoD core functions, 2) Outcome-based performance measures, 3) Benchmarking when applicable, and 4) Business Process Re-engineering.
Business Case:	Title 40/CCA compliance process is fully integrated into the JCIDS process.
Unit:	ICD
Defect:	ICD is not CCA compliant
Customer Specifications:	ICD is CCA compliant.
Start:	When draft ICD or predecessor capabilities-based assessment report is presented to the Joint Staff knowledge management decision support system for comment
Stop:	When Material Development Decision (MDD) is approved
Scope:	All materiel solution investments leading to a Component or OSD MDD

Improves Decision Support to MDD

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	Dec 08		
Measure	dd mm yy		
Analyze	dd mm yy		
Improve	dd mm yy		
Control	dd mm yy		

Defining BPR & Clarifying BPR [illegible]es

Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliation	DACI
TBD	**Sponsor**	**DoD CIO**	**Approver**
Roy Mabry	**Green Belt Candidate**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
Tomatra Minor	**MBB**	**DoD CIO**	**Driver**
TBD	**Process Owner**	**TBD**	**Approver**

LSS Charter

Problem Statement:	**A substantial majority, x % (y out of 37) of the sampled MAIS stakeholders interviewed see BPR as potentially value-added, but add that CCA oversight of BPR amounts to just a "check in the box". Thus BPR is neither consistently understood nor implemented/applied thereby failing to meet Title 40/CCA compliance requirements.**
Business Case:	**In order for BPR to be done effectively, MAIS Functional Proponents must understand:** **▪What is BPR?** **▪Who is responsible for completing BPR?** **▪When should BPR be conducted?**
Unit:	**BPR Design Documentation that will address <u>What</u> BPR is, <u>Who</u> is responsible for conducting BPR and <u>When</u> BPR should be completed.**
Success factor (instead of Defect):	**BPR Design Documentation meets a set of x (S. M. A. R. T.)* criteria**
Customer Specifications:	**The DoD community will understand BPR.**
Start:	**The BPR WHAT/WHO/WHEN knowledge level prior to the introduction of the BPR Design Documentation.**
Stop:	**The BPR WHAT/WHO/WHEN knowledge level after the introduction**

Defining the <u>What</u>, <u>Who</u>, and <u>When</u> of BPR will ensure that BPR is consistently understood

***S.M.A.R.T. = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Reliable and Timely**

Timeline

Phase	Planned	Actual	Status
Define	**dd mm yy**	**dd mm yy**	
Measure	**dd mm yy**		
Analyze	**dd mm yy**		
Improve	**dd mm yy**		
Control	**dd mm yy**		

Project Sub-Team Members/Organizations

Sub-teams (CCA Elements)	Sub-Team Members and Organizations
Support core mission functions	**Team Lead: Robert Bolluyt (TMA)**, John Burson (DON CIO), Patricia Cashin (BTA)
MOEs/PIRs (Outcome Perf Measures)	**Team Lead: LTC Rose Card (Army CIO/G6)**, Len Sadauskas (DCIO), Amelia Grazioso (DCIO), CDR Ben Torreon (J6), Jack Zavin (NII), Patricia Cashin (BTA), Neal Zank (AFCIO), Bill Cooper (J8 Advisor)
Business Process Reengineering (BPR)	**Team Lead: Tom Hickok (DCIO)**, Patricia Cashin (BTA), Carolyn Grant (BTA), Leslie Margolis (BTA), Marilyn Kraus (BTA), Graeme Douglas (BTA), Michael Stewart (BTA), Mary Ann Engelbert (DON RDA), Robert Pratt (DAU)
Outsourcing Determination	**Team Lead: Rick Perron (DCIO)**, Ed Wingfield (DCIO), Leo Milanowski (NII Acq)
Analysis of Alternatives (AOA)	**Team Lead: Ed Wingfield (DCIO)**, Bill May (NII Acq), Gabe Leyva (NII Acq), LTC Rose Card (Army CIO/G6), Bob Marcinczyk (PA&E Advisor)_
Economic Analysis (EA)	**Team Lead: Ed Wingfield (DCIO)**, Bill May (NII Acq), Gabe Leyva (NII Acq), Ron Wilson (PA&E Advisor)
Program Performance Measures	**Team Lead: Bob Leach (AT&L)**, Ric Sylvester (AT&L), MaryAnn Engelbert (DON RDA), Tammy Ortega (DLA), Ed Zick (DCIO), Amelia Grazioso (DCIO), Dave Mullins (NII Acq), Bill May (NII Acq)
Global Info Grid/Info Support Plan (GIG/ISP)	**Team Lead: Ed Zick (DCIO)**, Paul Szabados (DCIO)
Information Assurance (IA)	**Team Lead: Art King (NII I&IA)**, Dominic Cussatt (NII I&IA)
Modular Contracting	**Team Lead: Bob Leach (AT&L)**, Ric Sylvester (AT&L), Col Scott Calisti (AT&L), Verne McKamey (AT&L DPAP), Mike Pelkey (AT&L DPAP), Dave Mullins (NII Acq), Amelia Grazioso (DCIO)